

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

STANFORD HEALTH CARE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-03995-TSH](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECUSAL**

Re: Dkt. No. 25

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Lakshmi Arunachalam's Motion for Recusal. ECF No. 25. Plaintiff seeks recusal of the undersigned judge

Because the same Judge appears biased and is disqualified and must recuse from this case as well as Case 12-4962-TSH, because he has failed to docket my filing in Case No. 12-4962-TSH, and has been collusively and wantonly arbitrary in his rulings, denying me access to the Court's processes and procedures and has not allowed me to file via CM/ECF in 12-4962-TSH and has been induced by solicitation from an intermeddling opposing counsel Candice Decaire in Case 12-4962-TSH, to not allow my attorneys to withdraw without a Court Hearing to be held at the same time as the Case Management Conference Hearing on October 4, 2018, when the three Plaintiff's attorneys have already withdrawn and I have accepted their withdrawal and they are not representing me anymore and are ineffective counsel, not responding to my requests to file papers for me.

Id. at 2.

The basis for Plaintiff's motion is not entirely clear, but it appears that Plaintiff's assertions of bias are based upon rulings by the undersigned that Plaintiff perceives as unfavorable. The motion is **DENIED**. Judicial rulings are not a proper ground for recusal. *See Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994). Plaintiff's *ex parte* hearing is request **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 13, 2018


THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge